

①

context

M E D I A

December 11, 1998

Theodore J. Kaczynski
04475-046
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

I am writing to you on the day after certain developments that I think auger well for the project I have come to think of as the historical revision of public reception of both you, your mistrial, and *Industrial Society and Its Future*.

To give you the context, I received a call from Greenberg (the last I have received this week thankfully) on Monday, December 7. He called to tell me that *60 minutes* had heard something about a Kaczynski book. I assumed this meant that Greenberg had blurted something out about your book to his brother, who works there. I was two clicks south of inflicting chromosomal damage to Gary's person. However, I reigned myself in and asked him to find out which book was being discussed.

I received a call maybe ten minutes later informing me that it was indeed Michael's book. This in no way alleviated my feeling of distrust with regard to Gary. He could not tell me how they had gotten wind of the book, and I was still furious at him for the missive-flurry he initiated over the weekend. As I think you know from Michael, there was a brief mention by a lawyer named Greenya published in *The Washington Lawyer*. This is where *60 Minutes* had discovered Michael's book. Later in the day, Michael received a phone call from Vicki Gordon, who is the Executive Story Editor at the *60 Minutes*. They spoke for quite some time, according to both Michael and Vicki (with whom I have now met), and they both had positive reports of that conversation.

On Tuesday morning, Vicki Gordon called me. She asked me a lot of questions about my relationship to you, Michael, and my interest in the subject matter. As these questions were of a general nature, I answered them in a general manner. I left my correspondence to you an unreported fact, and made it sound like I had ferreted out Mello's book on my own. I told her that I had had some correspondence with you in connection with Michael's book.

She then startled me by asking about your 2255 motion. She did not call it a 2255, but it was clear she had some information that I thought was secret. She said that your family was aware of

(2)

the intent to appeal the plea, and she went so far as to specify that you would file the motion in January or May. She would not tell me where she had gotten this information.

I told her that I was not aware of any motion. I told her this was not my understanding, and that I only knew that there were some issues, raised by Mello's book, that call into serious question certain aspects of your case. The conversation then turned to Mello's book, and she asked if I would meet her for lunch. We had lunch yesterday, December 10.

Previous to meeting with her, I had spent a lot of time considering just what I would and would not tell her. Michael's opinion was that she could be trusted. I wanted to think so, but had not yet formed an opinion. I was intent on determining if she was genuinely interested to know the truth about you and your trial. We discussed many things regarding the trial, all of which being topics discussed in *The United States of America v. Theodore John Kaczynski*. She made it clear, after two hours, that she was going to do a segment on Michael's book. This would be done in connection with the trial, but she wanted more information. She said the story would take some time to put together, since Michael's book would only be a starting point for the larger story, which was, in her mind, the motion to appeal your guilty plea on the grounds that it was coerced.

During lunch she told me that Mello's manuscript had already arrived. Since Michael had asked me to give her the manuscript, I was suspicious. She had already invited me to take a look at the office. So, with the suspicion that Gary was somehow involved, I decided that I would accept her offer of a tour so that I could better determine the source of the manuscript she had received. A side thought was that the manuscript in question belonged to Alston Chase. If that were the case I would have obtained a copy from her. You should know that I intend to obtain a copy as soon as it is finished (since I know someone at Viking who can secret one away), but it is not due in until March. I want to know exactly what Chase has written, since I understand some of it is wrong-headed.

Since the restaurant she took me to was nearby the *60 Minutes* office, we walked. During our walk she asked about the fate of your book, since she had seen the Bender quote when I did earlier in the year. I had told her earlier that your book would not be published by anyone, that there were legal technicalities associated with the motion to appeal. In other words, I gave her misinformation to throw her off the track. But she was truly interested. This was clear to me. So, I told her that I had the chance to read your manuscript, and that it was an extraordinary book. But I reiterated the fact that due to unavoidable circumstances, it would not be published. This is when I decided to tell her: We had arrived at the CBS building. It happened that we were alone in the elevator. I pretended to scan the elevator, which she noted, and said, "This thing isn't bugged." She aped me and said, "I don't think so." I then said, "I will be publishing Ted's book."

The elevator doors opened onto the *60 Minutes* office. She had already asked if I would like to meet Mike Wallace, who would be her first choice were a show to be done about the trial. I had declined, since I was very tired and we had more to discuss. But as I said this, Wallace barreled out (to the extent that an 80-year-old can barrel) from around a corner. I sped up my pace,

pretending not to notice him so that she was left behind me to exchange greetings and then catch up with me. It seemed to me that he was lying in wait. She then walked me around the office. We passed by Wallace's office. He was sitting at his desk and made another attempt to greet us, me in particular that time, but I nodded pleasantly and continued down the hallway since I was firm in my resolve to determine what was what with Gordon.

She is very serious about getting your side of the story out to the American people. She told me that 30 million people watch the program. What followed was rather satisfying. I became emotional more than once while explaining why your story was of historical importance, and that my sense of the situation was that history, quite simply, had been whitewashed. I informed her of my belief that your family situation, understood correctly, rebuffs much of what has been said about you, which amounts to character assassination. She was moved. She offered to dedicate an entire, sixty-minute program to your plight. One section would begin with Mello's side of the story from a legal point of view, the next would presumably discuss the 2255, and then she suggested an interview with you, of any duration (my guess is about one-half hour, but I am sure it could be shorter or longer). She offered you the opportunity to give a blow-by-blow rebuttal of the lies your family told about you when Wallace interviewed them. She offered, in short, to accommodate you completely. You would be able to dictate who was interviewed, I believe. I also believe that you would be able to influence the general gist of the questions asked by Wallace, or another reporter if you find that more appealing.

I told her that you would enter into an interview with your own game plan, and that you were not to be foiled, but aided, in your efforts to communicate your message to the audience. I trust her when she says that you will be thusly aided. She is a good woman, and very smart.

A few points: At one point in the conversation I looked through the window and noticed the railroad tracks that follow the Hudson River north toward Albany, and Ulster County, where I would much rather live. I said, "Those tracks go up to Ulster County. It'd be great to live up there. But I can't do it yet." She said, "Why not?" My response was that my press made it necessary for me to be in New York, and that my meeting with her was an instance of that necessity. She then said something that I understood to be disingenuous: "Sometimes it really gets to me, all of this. I would really like to live out in nature."

She could tell by my reaction that she had said something "wrong." I paused and said, "Up to this point, I have enjoyed talking to you, but now it seems you are paying lip-service to me." She became visibly perturbed with me and gave my cars a thrubbing. It turns out that she is a professional with two children she never sees, and she feels this estrangement from her children and husband stinging. She told me that she resented my incredulous attitude, and that there were many people who felt the same way, although they work within the establishment.

I then asked her if she in any way subscribed to the views put forth in *Industrial Society and Its Future*. She obviously did, although she did not demonstrate a particularly impressive knowledge of the text. We then spent a considerable amount of time discussing that text, and she seemed

edified. I then reminded her that any program with which you cooperated would have to begin with certain presuppositions. The main premise, somewhat tautologically, would be that you would establish the main premise. I then said that it should be made clear during the program that *Industrial Society* marks the beginning of a conversation that will make the world a habitable place in the future. That this book and the events surrounding it will begin the process of change that can only conclude with a people who are not enslaved by the cage of coerced "responsibility" that is engendered by propagandistic notions of good citizenry. *Industrial Society and Its Future* will help society understand how it can reverse the destruction that it has visited upon itself. I believe she is line with these intentions. If you were ever to grant an interview, I cannot think of another place where it would have more impact. I would not be surprised if you had an audience of 50 million people. This is how things change.

Vicki Gordon was appalled to learn that she had been a party to the lies your family told the press. One thing that bothered her in particular, oddly to my mind, was the fact that your mother never read *Scientific American* to you. I mentioned no more than three particulars from your book. They were the aforementioned item, the fact that your brother "sold out" (citing his former opinions vis-a-vis Sirhan Sirhan, Hinckley, and the Challenger explosion), and that you never played trombone late at night when your were a student at Harvard.

You should know that Quin Denvir and Judy Clarke received a letter when *60 Minutes* was preparing the show that featured your family, and you were offered the chance to respond. Gordon also told me that she wrote a letter, but that you probably construed it as "too business-like." This letter was sent in May.

I believe Gordon will do everything within her ken to create a powerful story that will indeed change the public perception. No one from your family will come anywhere near it. You are the professor here, and absolutely no one is going to tell you how to conduct class. You have a chance to teach people something that is very much for their own good, something that is not fatalistically destructive to their personal freedom. You will have the chance to show people who you are, and they will be as pleased to make your acquaintance as I continue to be.

As for the contract, I am beginning to feel uncomfortable, since time marches on regardless of our will. There are many things that need to be done between now and the time your book is published. Your first serial, as you know, is one of those things, and this cannot be done without a contract in hand. I have not heard from you about *Vanity Fair*, but I should tell you that as of yesterday I might consider pursuing *Time*. There is nothing that says we have to give anything to VF. My reason for choosing them is that it is counter-intuitive. People have seen you portrayed as a "mad bomber" in the big weeklies. You would be on the cover of any large weekly that ran your excerpt, but some monstrosity of representation could be used there. VF will do nothing of the sort, but you would probably not be on the cover. I would like very much to hear what your preferences are regarding this subject.

Back to the contract, I am willing to accept a no-edit clause that includes the copyright problems. If I get sued, so be it. I trust that any evidence of text that could cause an injunction will be met with the appropriate seriousness, and that we will be able to effect the necessary changes effected only by your direction in an ex-contract manner. I am now, I believe, a complete proselyte to the project that is your public rehabilitation and legal empowerment, although I am doubtless a tyro in your eyes. I hope this is your impression. Please let's get this settled. You should know that I will not send Bonnie a copy of your manuscript until you tell me to, since I have no way of knowing who's who at this point. Witness Tony Serra, whose actions leave me feeling flummoxed and baffled.

I look forward to your responses to all of this.

Michael has kindly offered to send this for the sake of time (ergo the facsimile transmission). So, I must end now, since he has a certain drop-off time. If it is missed, he then has to drive over to New Hampshire to send his package by express mail, and I believe there is some snow falling up there.

I hope this note finds you well, and you are satisfied with the above developments.

My best,

Beau.